

Open Research Online

The Open University's repository of research publications and other research outputs

'No Picture more Charming': The Family Portrait in Eighteenth-Century France

Journal Item

How to cite:

Barker, Emma (2017). 'No Picture more Charming': The Family Portrait in Eighteenth-Century France. *Art History*, 40(3) pp. 526–553.

For guidance on citations see [FAQs](#).

© 2016 Association of Art Historians



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Version: Accepted Manuscript

Link(s) to article on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1111/1467-8365.12247>

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Open Research Online's data [policy](#) on reuse of materials please consult the policies page.

oro.open.ac.uk

‘No Picture more Charming’: The Family Portrait in Eighteenth-Century France

In his educational treatise *Émile* (1762), Jean-Jacques Rousseau famously calls upon women to abandon the practice of sending infants away to a wet nurse. Breast-feeding her own offspring is a mother’s first duty, he declares, and its dereliction brings about the corruption of the entire moral order: ‘the touching spectacle of a budding family no longer attaches husbands, no longer imposes respect on strangers’. If only they would deign to fulfil this duty, women could give rise to a ‘general reform’ by drawing their husbands back to the home to share in the cares (and the joys) of child-rearing. No less crucial than the mother’s obligation to nurse her children, that is to say, is the father’s responsibility for their education. Accordingly, Rousseau pours scorn not only on the woman who insists that her social life or fragile health make necessary the hiring of a wet-nurse, but also on the man who claims that his business affairs or official duties leave him no choice but to pay others to teach his children or to send them away to school: ‘There is no picture more charming than that of the family, but a single missing feature disfigures all the others’.¹

What is striking about this passage is the way that it transforms the ethical imperatives of domestic life into aesthetic priorities by characterizing the exemplary family as an appealing spectacle. This tendency is summed up in the identification of the family as a picture, that is, in the original French, a *tableau*. As it was defined at the time, this word primarily referred to a work of art painted on a support and surrounded by a frame, but also, more figuratively, signified a lively and convincing representation in any medium. The idea of the *tableau* also carried strong connotations of a coherent structure, one that could be readily comprehended in a single glance; to this end, such a representation was required to respect the unities of time, sight and space.² In all of these respects, the *tableau* is analogous to the family as Rousseau conceives of it; the latter too is a self-contained and internally harmonious unit occupying an enclosed space (the home, in short), at once natural and ordered (in its nurturing and educational functions). Neither, moreover, exists in and of itself; just as the *tableau* is designed to be seen by a viewer, so the Rousseauian family is constituted in relation to the gaze of an outsider, whose respect and esteem must be earned.

Although Rousseau’s characterization of the family as a *tableau* has not escaped notice, the type of picture he might have had in mind (as distinct from those that his text prefigures) has been left unexplored.³ However, the term ‘*un tableau de famille*’, seems to have had a precise meaning at the time. It first appears in the *Salon livret* for 1737, the year that the exhibition became a regular event, as the title of a lost work by Nicolas Delobel; the four other pictures exhibited at the *Salon* under this title before 1789 can all be identified as group portraits of particular individuals. By contrast, domestic scenes of generic figures seem never to have been thus described.⁴ Moreover, Rousseau’s insistence that the picture should depict the whole family, not least the father, accords with the restriction of the term to portraits that include the male head of the family as well as mother and children, as evidenced by the titles of those for which the sitters are named in the *livret*: *M. Goubert et sa famille*, for example, or *La Famille de M. le comte de Schouwloff*.⁵ It would also usually have been he who commissioned the picture. In 1723, for example, Jean Raoux was summoned to the financier Joseph Bonnier de la Mosson’s château near Montpellier to complete a ‘large family picture’, which ‘afterwards adorned the dining room of M. Bonnier’s house in Paris’.⁶ In short, the charming picture evoked by Rousseau would have been a family portrait, though the comparative paucity of surviving examples (around fifty are known to me) suggests that few of his reader are likely to have had one hanging on their own walls.

Eighteenth-century French family portraits remain a very under-explored topic, however, certainly by comparison with equivalent British paintings.⁷ Louis Hautecoeur's *Les Peintres de la vie familiale* (1945) continues to be cited as the principal authority for its development, most recently by Amy Freund in her work on family portraiture of the revolutionary era. Early in the century, so the argument goes, the sitters for such portraits were portrayed more or less independently on the same canvas, linked to each other mostly by pointing fingers, against the backdrop of an imaginary interior or landscape, in a manner suggestive of formal, distant relationships. From mid-century, however, they began to be depicted closer together and even embracing one another, often within their domestic environment, thereby offering an informal and intimate vision of family life.⁸ The transformation is attributed to broad socio-cultural shifts, which gave rise to a new set of domestic ideals, at once enlightened and sentimental, that were embraced by members of the educated elite. A more direct source of inspiration for the new-style family portrait is located in the moralizing subject pictures of 'genre' painters, such as Jean-Baptiste Greuze. Indeed, Philippe Bordes has characterized the more animated and intimate family portraits of the later eighteenth century as 'portraiture in the mode of genre'; in so doing, he also aligns this type of picture with the forces of modernity.⁹

This type of account owes a fundamental debt to the historian Philippe Ariès, who himself drew extensively on visual evidence in tracing 'the discovery of childhood' and, with it, the rise of the modern family. Interpreting family portraiture in the light of the paradigm established by Ariès in *L'Enfant et la vie familiale sous l'ancien régime* (1960) thus runs the risk of circularity, a problem compounded by the serious flaws that have been identified in his use of images as historical evidence.¹⁰ Moreover, Ariès's work does as much to contradict as to confirm the narrative outlined above since he contends that the developments he traces were largely complete by the end of the seventeenth century. For him, Charles Le Brun's portrait of the banker Everhard Jabach and his family of circa 1660 already represents a modern family centred on the young child: 'The little Jabach', he declares, 'has exactly the same pose as that of the modern baby in front of the studio photographer's camera (Plate 1).'¹¹ Ariès's chronology reflects the central role played by Christian reformers and teachers in his narrative; by instead locating the crucial moment of transition a century later, during the Enlightenment, other scholars reinforce the secular, progressive credentials of the modern family. In so doing so, however, the art historians among them are left with the problem of what to make of the seventeenth-century family portraits to which Ariès accorded such significance, a problem often solved by skirting round them.¹²

My aim therefore is to chart the development of the French family portrait from shortly before 1700 until the Revolution without relying on a schematic contrast between the modern family, on the one hand, and a traditional one characterized in essentially negative terms (no concept of childhood, an absence of intimacy, etc.), on the other. As the historian Orest Ranum has argued, such pictures need to be analysed systematically, so as to attend to continuities as well as changes; even the most intimate family portraits have a hierarchical structure that corresponds to the 'patriarchal order of private life', in that the husband's head is typically higher than that of his wife, unless he is dignified by being shown seated. Moreover, in addition to the mundane domestic objects that surround the sitters, they often include columns, urns, busts and flowers, such as might be found on a tomb, demonstrating that such pictures functioned as much to transcend as to record family life in the here and now.¹³ Whereas Ranum argues that the tomb analogy is strengthened by the characteristic anonymity of the mostly nameless sitters, which focuses attention on broad historical questions, however, I would contend that the historical significance of family portraits is

bound up with the particular purposes that they served, which can only be grasped by establishing the likely reasons for which the individual patron (who might on occasion be a woman) commissioned one.¹⁴

Above all, taking my cue from the passage from *Émile* with which I began, I will argue that family portraits are statements addressed to an outsider. Often monumental in scale, they would have hung in reception rooms where visitors could see them; those painted by academicians might be exhibited at the Salon, especially, of course, after 1737, so that the circle of viewers expanded to include total strangers. In other words, the family portrait became a relatively more public phenomenon around the time that it began to offer an apparently more informal and immediate vision of domestic life within the private domain of the home. This seeming paradox can be illuminated with reference to Jürgen Habermas's classic account of the 'bourgeois public sphere', which, he argues, developed as 'the sphere of private people come together as a public'. New cultural forms, most obviously the sentimental novel (Habermas's example), but also, by extension, sentimental paintings by artists such as Greuze contributed to this development by functioning as a public manifestation of private identities, which are thereby at once consolidated and moralized.¹⁵ The transformation of the family portrait along similar lines can thus be seen to be bound up with the transfer of political authority away from the monarch, the sole public person in an absolutist polity, towards the collective interest of the public good or *patrie*.¹⁶ In making this case, I shall also consider whether these developments should be understood to have a specifically bourgeois character, as in Habermas's analysis, or whether, as Sarah Maza has argued, such a class-based analysis is misconceived.¹⁷ As will be seen, family portraits do seem to have been typically, though by no means exclusively, commissioned by members of the bourgeoisie.

The Family Portrait before 1737

In the period around 1700, the family portrait still represented something of a novelty, so much so that no label for it yet existed. Artists were generally said to have painted portraits of a family in the same picture ('dans un même tableau'). Pierre Mignard's biographer, for example, records that, 'having received the order to do the portraits of the royal family', he 'painted in the same picture Monseigneur [that is, Louis XIV's heir, the 'Grand Dauphin'], Madame the Dauphine and the three princes their sons' (Plate 2).¹⁸ Almost without precedent in France when it was executed, a large-scale royal family portrait must have presented the artist with something of a challenge.¹⁹ He would have been familiar with Le Brun's portrait of the Jabach family, which hung in the banker's Parisian residence, but a close-knit grouping of figures in a cluttered interior no doubt seemed insufficiently dignified for the purpose.²⁰ Mignard instead turned for a model to Anthony Van Dyck's portrait of the family of Charles I, a copy of which (then attributed to Van Dyck himself) was in the collection of the duc d'Orléans in the Palais Royal; he subsequently used much the same composition for a portrait of the family of Charles's son, the deposed James II.²¹ Like Van Dyck's painting, the portrait of the Dauphin's family depicts the royal couple seated at a table, mother and baby to the right, father in front of a vista of the outside world to the left, thereby identifying them as a domestic unit characterized by contrasting gender roles.

However, unconstrained by the requirement to uphold the authority of a monarch, Mignard was able to heighten the informality and intimacy that Van Dyck brought to bear on the royal family portrait.²² The Dauphin leans casually against the table, idly caressing a large dog, while his youngest son, the duc de Berry, clutching a coral rattle, sits (semi) naked on a

cushion beside his mother; 'just like the little Jabach', remarks Ariès.²³ What the historian fails to note is that the infant prince is identified as such by the blue ribbon of the order of the saint-esprit that he wears. Moreover, if the touching innocence of the putto-like child occupies centre stage, the composition as a whole is shaped by dynastic considerations. Both parents direct their gaze towards the eldest son and heir, the duc de Bourgogne, who himself engages the viewer with his gaze; by depicting the young prince playing at hunting, with a spear in one hand and a dog at his feet, the artist at once celebrates the martial spirit appropriate to a future king and suggests a likeness to his hunting-mad father.²⁴ The treatment of the duc d'Anjou, seated on a cushion right in the foreground cuddling a pet dog, combines childish playfulness with princely dignity in a matter befitting his status as the middle son. Significantly, the verse beneath Simon Thomassin's print after the picture refers to all three as 'these young heroes', in whom 'happy France' sees its kings and perhaps those of 'the whole universe'.²⁵

Both the unprecedented commission of a royal family portrait and the joint emphasis on the young princes can be explained with reference to a crisis that took place at court in 1686, shortly before it was painted. In January that year, Louis XIV was taken ill with a painful anal fistula, for which the only cure was a risky operation; fears for the king's life only dissipated after he finally agreed to surgery in November.²⁶ The whole episode nevertheless served as a reminder of the king's mortality; in this context, Mignard's painting offered assurance that the succession was guaranteed by the recent births of no fewer than three heirs. However, whatever the official message of the portrait, the fistula crisis also gave encouragement to those courtiers who opposed Louis XIV's bellicose and intolerant rule and looked to the dauphin as the best hope for the future. For the 'Cabale de Monseigneur', which included several other royal princes, the painting must have had special resonance.²⁷ Significantly, it was transferred at some point from the château of Versailles to that of Meudon where the dauphin spent much of his time after it was made over to him in 1695 and which became a kind of rival court.²⁸ The political significance of the image is further attested by the production of a print, formally presented to the king by Thomassin in April 1689, which publicized it to an audience beyond the court.²⁹ It seems likely that Mignard's composition was intended from the first to circulate in engraved form; the flying putti raising a drapery as if to unveil the scene to an uninitiated viewer suggest as much.

What is indubitable is that the portrait of the Dauphin's family functioned to transform the reigning dynasty of France into an appealing public spectacle, thereby contributing to the process that Simon Schama has termed the domestication of majesty.³⁰ Such domestication must be understood to be an essentially pictorial construct, one that offered a fantasy of intimacy in defiance of the strict etiquette of court life, which would have ensured that the Dauphin, Dauphine and their sons seldom shared the same space. However, the artifice of the scene is not peculiar to the royal family portrait, but, on the contrary, reminiscent of Le Brun's equivalent painting of bourgeois sitters, in which Jabach is shown flanked by (and pointing towards) his famous art collection as well as by his wife and children; it also includes the artist's own image reflected in a mirror, testifying to his friendship with the banker.³¹ Mignard too celebrated the collector as well as the father by showing the Dauphin with one of the vases he amassed at his feet, reinforcing the point by rhyming the vase with an urn behind his head; it should be noted that the prince's connoisseurship was part of what made him attractive to dissident courtiers.³² More broadly, this royal family portrait testifies at once to the public status that was the preserve of the monarchy under the absolutist system and to the first stirrings of a politics of contestation that put the ruling dynasty under new pressure to legitimate itself before the tribunal of public opinion.³³ In this respect too,

however, the picture can be assimilated to the portrait of the Jabach family, insofar as a *nouveau riche* of foreign origin also stood in need of public legitimation; hence the gesture by which he draws our attention to his principal claim not just to fame but also to esteem.

However, the royal family portrait differs from its bourgeois counterpart in having been commissioned in response to a dynastic crisis, a point that applies to both of those painted by Mignard. The same can be said of a number of noble family portraits dating from around 1700, many of which relied on the device of the portrait-within-a-portrait to commemorate a deceased relative or to affirm loyalty to a patron.³⁴ In 1698, for example, Nicolas de Largillière painted the marquise de Noailles, accompanied by her two daughters, seated beneath a medallion of the king and pointing at a portrait of her husband, who had died on campaign in Flanders, held by a black page (Plate 3).³⁵ Undoubtedly commissioned to repair (symbolically at least) the crisis in the family fortunes brought about the loss of its head, the picture exemplifies the monumental ambitions of the family portrait, despite its comparatively small scale. Noble family portraits might also, however, function to reinforce a successful dynastic strategy. After the death of Louis XIV, for example, Largillière's former student, Jean-Baptiste Oudry, was apparently commissioned to paint one by the duc de Noailles, nephew of the aforementioned marquis, whose fortunes were then at a high point. Thanks to his marriage in 1698 to the niece of Mme de Maintenon, the Noailles were allied to the main centre of power at court at the time, but hedged their bets by allying with factions likely to gain power on the king's death, such that the duke was appointed president of the newly established council of finance in 1715; two years later, a grand dynastic match was contracted between the Noailles's eldest daughter and Prince Charles of Lorraine.³⁶ As well as the family portrait, Oudry was commissioned to paint several retrospective likenesses of illustrious ancestors for a gallery in their château; displayed together, they would have functioned as a statement of the reassertion of hereditary noble authority during the regency.³⁷

Non-nobles might also commission family portraits for dynastic purposes, with the difference that they did so in order to consolidate the foundation of a new lineage; they might also, particularly if they had court connections, employ the device of the portrait-within-a-portrait. Exemplary in this respect is Jacques Dumont's portrait of Louis XV's wet-nurse, Mme Mercier, holding up a likeness of the now adult king to the admiring gaze of her family (Plate 4). Like earlier portraits commissioned by royal governesses (who, unlike the bourgeois wet-nurse, were noblewomen who inherited their position), the picture testifies to the role that a woman could play in advancing her family's fortunes if she held a post at court that brought her into regular contact with the king.³⁸ In its size and splendour, the painting attests to the exceptional access and extraordinary favour that Mme Mercier enjoyed and to the many privileges and considerable wealth that she had reaped as a result. Her selection of Dumont, a relative of her husband's, for the task is indicative of the patronage that she could now offer in her turn and of the power of kinship networks in France at the time. As with Oudry's portrait of the Noailles, the prompt for the commission came from a turning point in the family's ascent; in 1731, Mme Mercier married off her two eldest daughters extremely advantageously to other officials in the royal household. The composition celebrates her maternal role, not least in being constructed as a pyramid of which she forms the axis while the son and daughter who both enjoyed the status of the king's milk sibling occupy the corners.³⁹ Nevertheless, due deference is also accorded to the established structures of patriarchal power since Mme Mercier not only holds the king's portrait, but also sits beside the standing figure of her husband.

However, family portraits on this scale remained exceptional, no doubt at least partly because of the huge expense of commissioning such a large and complex composition from an established portrait painter like Largillière.⁴⁰ The only artist to have painted family portraits with any consistency in the opening decades of the century, Robert Le Vrac, known as Tournières, did so on a small-scale and even he seems to have produced no more than a handful.⁴¹ On his Salon debut in 1704, he exhibited one of the goldsmith Nicolas Delaunay and his family (Plate 5), which again celebrates a status achieved in royal service. Seated in the centre of the composition, as befits his status as head of the family, Delaunay is shown in the *Cabinet des médailles* in the Louvre, which he had fitted out after being appointed director of the *Monnaie des médailles* (medals mint) in 1697, pointing towards a table ornament that evokes those he had executed for the king, a medal of whom hangs down in front of the table while another of the Dauphin and his sons can be seen behind. The flowers in the foreground suggest that the picture may commemorate Delaunay's wife, who died in 1702, but it was probably prompted by his purchase of the office of *secrétaire du roi*, an immensely expensive sinecure that brought the holder noble status, in 1704.⁴² The boy standing in front of him is presumably the eldest son whom he hoped would succeed him, though, in the event, both of his direct male heirs having since died, he bequeathed his position at the Louvre to his son-in-law. In short, the portrait functions to consolidate an ascent based in typical fashion on an accumulation of great wealth, office-holding and noble status.

The portrait of the Delaunay family is also typical of such pictures in having been commissioned from an artist with whom the patron already had some kind of relationship. As a noted art collector and *conseiller amateur* of the Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture, the goldsmith would already have been acquainted with Tournières.⁴³ In some cases, the prompt for the commission may have come from the painter as much as from the sitters: for example, Largillière's friend and rival, Hyacinthe Rigaud, seems only to have painted families with whom he had an existing (even intimate) relationship; all three such portraits he painted depict a close-knit group consisting of husband, wife and daughter.⁴⁴ The same trio of figures appears in a painting by Largillière traditionally said to depict his own family, but more likely to have been commissioned by a financier, that is, someone able to afford the vast price the artist would have charged for such a picture (Plate 6).⁴⁵ A composite of distinct portrait types, it somewhat incongruously juxtaposes an elegant lady, sumptuously attired, and a young girl singing, her music in her hand, both of whom would look more at home in a domestic interior, to a gentleman in the informal yet aristocratic guise of a hunter, a portrait type favoured by the new rich.⁴⁶ The resulting contrast of gender roles is reinforced by the way that the father alone engages the viewer's gaze, thereby asserting his proprietary role as head of the family. Centring as it does on the girl, the composition functions to showcase her attractions and hence advertise her eligibility; her parents probably sought to enhance the family's social status by marrying off their daughter to a nobleman, to which end the painting was presumably commissioned.

Even if Largillière's portrait does not depict his own family, other painters did deploy this type of picture for the purpose of self-promotion. Often, these pictures were the only one of its kind that the artist ever executed.⁴⁷ It is true of Jean-Marc Nattier's family portrait (Plate 7), begun around 1730, in which he stands behind a chair holding the tools of his trade, leaving the rest of the space to his wife and children. Both Mme Nattier's satin dress and her harpsichord (which she did actually own) attest to the prosperity that his portrait practice has brought them. Like Largillière's anonymous family group, it thus offers a contrast of gendered roles, though in this case refined feminine leisure is opposed to masculine

professional identity. Although the prominence of young children gives the scene a more domestic character than most previous family portraits, the dynastic dimension remains key; the artist's side-long gaze connects him to the wide-eyed stare of his small son, so young that he still wears a dress, who appears directly below his father, grasping a *porte crayon* as a token of Nattier's hope that the boy would follow in his footsteps. In these respects, the portrait exemplifies the use of such pictures as a marker of social ascent, albeit inflected by the specifics of artistic identity. However, it remained unfinished until over thirty years later, around the time that he started to write his memoirs, when the now aged and ill artist took it up again, apparently as a memorial to his wife and son, both of whom had since died; the pair of snuffed out candles on the harpsichord symbolize their loss.⁴⁸ The painting thus came to have a commemorative function; it is a monument to professional achievement, marital union and dynastic ambition, all of them things of the past by the time it was exhibited in 1763.

The Family Portrait at the Salon

The reception accorded Nattier's painting was at best tactful, the critics mostly remarking politely on his former reputation, apart from Denis Diderot, who appears to have been unaware of the work's retrospective character.⁴⁹ His hostile remarks were not especially novel, however. Almost as soon as the Salon became a regular event, such pictures elicited negative reviews, typically deploring what Étienne de La Font de Saint-Yenne described as their 'customary defect'. He was prompted to do so by Tournières's portrait of the *fermier-général* (tax farmer) Michel Lallemant de Betz and his family, originally exhibited in 1725, when it was re-exhibited in reworked form in 1746. The over twenty figures (La Font wrote), who 'neither talk nor look at each other, all of them having their eyes fixed on the viewer, look like statues, or like people playing the Medusa game, who are compelled to hold the exact attitude in which they were caught'.⁵⁰ Conversely, in 1757, Louis-Michel Van Loo's portrait of his uncle, the history painter Carle Van Loo, and the latter's wife, the opera singer Cristina Antonia Somis, both of them shown actively engaged in their profession, with their children (Plate 8), elicited the approving comment that the figures did not 'seem occupied in showing themselves to the viewer, as is all too usually the case in family portraits'. Another critic declared that Van Loo had 'found the secret of making a history painting out of a collection of portraits'.⁵¹ As this remark indicates, group portraits (known as *portraits historiés*) were expected to manifest the internal coherence and formal discipline of a tableau, such that all the figures were subordinated to some unifying action.⁵²

In the context of the Salon, painters of family portraits thus found themselves facing a set of demands radically at odds with those of their patrons, for whom likeness, which required the faces to be turned towards the viewer, was a crucial criterion. The emergence of a new kind of critical discourse around mid-century constituted something of a crisis for members of the Academy, all of whom potentially risked being accused of pandering to private patrons rather than producing properly public-spirited works of art (which primarily meant high-minded history painting).⁵³ Portraitists, in particular, were regularly criticized for gratifying the vanity of wealthy nonentities and idle coquettes when they ought to have been celebrating the great and good.⁵⁴ In this context, it is important to note that Van Loo was praised in 1757 not only for displaying 'the facility that characterizes a history painter', but also for depicting 'a family distinguished by its talents, united and hard-working'; this critic also remarked that the painting was inspired by the 'tender attachment of a nephew to his uncle'.⁵⁵ In short, the criterion of unity was as much ethical as aesthetic; by painting his relatives occupied both by their work and by each other, Van Loo endowed his family portrait both with history painting's dramatic logic and its exemplary significance. It was because of the scope it

offered on both counts that this type of portrait brought into focus what Diderot characterized as the conflict between resemblance and composition, the one trivial and evanescent, the other of enduring value.⁵⁶

In demanding that family portraits emphasize affective bonds rather than individual likeness, moral worth as much as or even instead of social distinction, the critics effectively oriented such pictures towards the wider public. Whether or not they had any prior knowledge of the family in question, members of the public could be moved by the mutual affection of the sitters and encouraged to emulate their domestic virtues. Although brought into focus by the critical discourse around family portraits in the context of the Salon, these demands seem to have been quite widely shared. The German art theorist Christian Ludwig von Hagedorn, for example, articulated similar concerns in *Betrachtungen über die Mahlerey* (1762), which appeared in French translation in 1775. Hagedorn complains that, for the most part, family portraits are so stiff and expressionless that they seem to have been painted by artists without any feelings. Instead, such pictures should be ‘monuments to the practical virtues of ordinary life’, with the preference being given to actions that ‘speak to the heart and foster reflection’. Denying that paintings of the ‘obscure virtues’ of honest citizens would be trivial and uninteresting, Hagedorn suggests as a model the new dramatic genre known as serious comedy or bourgeois tragedy: ‘If only painting would produce a Destouches or a Diderot!’⁵⁷ The relevance of this type of play to the family portrait lies not only in its domestic subject-matter, but also in its use of tableaux to convey its underlying moral and emotional significance to the spectator (Diderot’s play, *Le Père de famille* (1762) was even translated into English in 1781 as *The Family Picture*).⁵⁸

Precisely how the family portrait would need to be transformed in order to meet these demands was elaborated by Diderot on the occasion of the Salon of 1765. He was prompted to do so by a (now untraced) painting by the Swedish portraitist Alexandre Roslin entitled *A Father arriving at his estate, where he is greeted by his children who tenderly love him. One sees in it portraits of this family*.⁵⁹ The father in question was the duc de la Rochefoucauld, who, after being exiled from court as punishment for his role in the king’s humiliation at Metz in 1744, resided on his estate at La Roche-Guyon until his death in 1762. The picture thus had a commemorative function, one no doubt reinforced by the concern of his widowed elder daughter, the duchesse d’Enville, to vindicate her father; his lack of a male heir and her own resultant succession may also have informed the commission.⁶⁰ In showing the duke being welcomed not only by his daughters and grandchildren but also by servants and peasants, Roslin celebrated him as an exemplary patriarch, not unlike the protagonist of *Le Père de famille*, who is a kindly employer and landowner as well as a loving father. Diderot complained, however, that Roslin’s picture lacked the joy, life and truth that it ought to have had, ‘because, of all the families in France, this is the most united, the most upright and the one in which they love each other the most, but that’s at home [*à l’hôtel*], not on Roslin’s canvas’.⁶¹ Here, as in the comment quoted above, ‘unity’ appears a loaded term, implicitly linking the harmony of virtuous domesticity to the formal unity of the tableau.

Nevertheless, in dramatizing the late duke’s virtues by depicting his return home rather than presenting his likeness in a portrait-within-a-portrait, Roslin went some way towards addressing the concerns expressed by the critics.⁶² According to Diderot, however, Greuze had done so far more convincingly in a rejected proposal for the same commission; he intended ‘to gather the family in a salon, in the morning, the men occupying themselves with experimental physics, the women with needlework, and children so unruly as to drive both to distraction’.⁶³ This scene recalls the tableaux of on-going domestic activity that Diderot

included in his plays, such as *Le Père de famille*, which opens with the characters playing tric-trac and reading.⁶⁴ As Stéphane Lojkin has observed, the text also echoes an episode in Rousseau's novel, *Julie, ou La nouvelle Héloïse* (1761), as described by the hero, Saint-Preux: 'We spent the morning in the English manner, gathered in silence'. In Hubert Gravelot's illustration of the *matinée à l'anglaise* (Plate 9), the assembled members of the household can be seen variously occupied, the men reading the newspaper, Julie engaged in embroidery and her sons looking at a picture book.⁶⁵ Whether or not Greuze did make such a proposal, he was widely associated with this type of domestic tableau; one ardent Rousseauist stated that the illustration of the *matinée à l'anglaise* in a new edition of *Julie* 'must be treated in the genre of Greuze'.⁶⁶ As applied to a ducal family portrait, such a scenario served to underline the sitters' common humanity, their simple virtue, qualities on which Diderot's description of life in the La Rochefoucauld household also insists.

More specifically, the proposal attributed to Greuze asserts the duke's claims to public esteem on the basis not of his high rank, great wealth or royal favour, but of the enlightened, benevolent spirit that he revealed in his private life. It highlights his fascination with the new knowledge of the period, which led him to equip La Roche-Guyon with books, scientific instruments and an observatory.⁶⁷ Even better, Diderot declared, was Greuze's further proposal, which involved 'bringing the peasants, fathers, mothers, sons, sisters and children to the château of the good seigneur, full of gratitude for the assistance they received from him during the food shortage of 1757. In that miserable year, M. de la Rochefoucauld sacrificed sixty thousand francs to provide work for everyone living on his estate'.⁶⁸ In this respect, the duke offered a model of enlightened paternalism, founded on investment in the rural economy, such as was then advocated by the group of economists known as the Physiocrats, whose theories the duchesse d'Enville put into practice at La Roche-Guyon and promoted at her Parisian salon. However, in the initial scenario, she and her sister, the duchesse d'Esstissac, are depicted as purely domestic creatures, plying their needle, like Julie in the *matinée à l'anglaise*, while the male members of the household attend to affairs of public import by reading the newspaper. Thus, the family portrait in the guise of a domestic tableau requires women to exemplify the virtues of private life, but restricts to men the capacity to grasp the significance of such virtues to the wider world beyond the home.

Diderot's text illuminates the extent to which the transformation of the family portrait was motivated by the new importance of the public sphere as a source of ideological legitimation. Such a tableau served to communicate in a readily intelligible and emotionally persuasive manner not simply the sitters' exemplary private life, but also, in so doing, their contribution to the common good. Of course, however, Greuze never did get the opportunity to paint the La Rochefoucauld family in this guise.⁶⁹ He also turned down another commission for a commemorative family portrait, this time in memory of Louis XV's heir, the dauphin, who died in 1765. So Diderot claimed, at any rate, in his review of Louis Lagrenée's depiction of 'the Dauphin dying, surrounded by his family' (as the *Salon livret* for 1767 put it) which was commissioned by the duc de La Vauguyon, governor of the royal children (Plate 10). Deriding the duke as a fanatical bigot who poisoned the young princes' minds, Diderot deplored the failure to devise a composition befitting 'a moral scene, a family scene, the final scene of a life, a scene of pathos and high pathos at that'.⁷⁰ He especially disliked the way that the painting combined exalted allegory and mundane naturalism by depicting the Dauphin looking serenely up at the crown of immortality held out by the naked airborne figure of his deceased eldest son, to whose presence the distraught Dauphine and their surviving sons remain oblivious.⁷¹ Nevertheless, in dramatizing the prince's death and, more

especially, his widow's grief, Lagrenée's picture brings private identities into the public realm in a manner unprecedented in commemorative family portraiture.

At the same time, the painting of the Dauphin's family looks back to earlier portraits commissioned by royal governesses insofar as it commemorates La Vauguyon's contribution to the young princes' education, symbolized by the globe, book and other objects in the foreground. He seems to have commissioned it as part of a dynastic strategy, aimed at compensating for the loss of the Dauphin's favour by gaining recognition as the guardian of his legacy, which was pursued by himself and his son, who had already published a eulogy of the dead prince's virtues, addressed to the new Dauphin, the future Louis XVI.⁷² The royal governor had himself depicted in person, with the prince's preceptor, the former bishop of Limoges, in another royal family portrait, by Charles Monnet, exhibited at the Salon of 1771.⁷³ Now lost, it commemorated the supervision of his sons' education that the Dauphin exercised in twice weekly sessions; it showed him with his youngest son in his lap and the eldest reciting his lesson while their mother turned from her embroidery frame to listen, all under the eye of a bust of the king. In short, it exemplified the gendered roles and engaged parenthood promoted by Rousseau in *Émile*, even if the presence of a governor and a tutor would hardly have met with his approval. Although the Dauphin in turn disapproved of *Émile* on religious grounds, he did read it and, more broadly, showed a concern to ensure that his sons had the best possible education that was motivated by anxiety about France's diminished power and his hope that his heirs would one day restore the crown's authority.⁷⁴

Both of the pictures commissioned by La Vauguyon are based on a dynastic conception of the royal family. His post as governor of the royal children gave him responsibility, it should be noted, only for the Dauphin's sons; their sisters, being unable to inherit the throne, did not count as *enfants de France* and were accordingly omitted from both compositions. Neither work adequately responded to the demand for the family portrait to be transformed into a harmonious tableau of mutual affection and domestic virtue; just as he had denounced the inadequacies of Lagrenée's painting, so Diderot dismissed Monnet's as cold and inexpressive, a view that seems to have been widely shared.⁷⁵ Nevertheless, La Vauguyon's commissions testify to the duke's awareness that it had become imperative to seek legitimation in the eyes of the public by demonstrating a commitment to the good of the *patrie* (conversely, the monarchy's failure to commission an equivalent portrait on its own account suggests a lack of any such awareness). The inclusion of a weeping personification of France in the earlier picture affirms that the Dauphin's death is his country's as well as his family's loss, while the later composition suggests that the prince would have been a good father to the nation as well as his own children. Similar aims inspired La Vauguyon to stage (and publicize) the occasion when the new young Dauphin tried his hand at the plough, thereby attesting to a Physiocrat-style valorisation of agriculture as the basis of national wealth.⁷⁶ Thus, as with the La Rochefoucauld commission, a sentimental and moralizing approach to family portraiture was accompanied by an engagement with political economy, both functioning to demonstrate the contribution made by its members to the public good.

The Family Portrait outside the Salon

Many family portraits were not exhibited at the Salon, however, and thus would have been viewed only by visitors to the residence in which they hung. Nevertheless, in such cases too, a shift can be discerned towards the dramatic logic and emotional unity of the tableau, albeit in a more limited way than the critics might have liked.⁷⁷ Notable in this respect is a family portrait of unidentified sitters, painted by François-Hubert Drouais in 1756 (Plate 11). Like the one by Largillière painted a few decades earlier, it depicts a husband, wife and daughter,

with the difference that they are shown in a domestic interior, as if caught in a moment of their everyday life.⁷⁸ Rather than gazing outwards in the manner so often derided, the couple turn towards each other; the daughter alone looks out at the viewer, who is thereby drawn into the scene as a witness to their affection for each other. Furthermore, though without the drama of a father's return home or death, Drouais's painting contains hints of a narrative for the viewer to tease out. The husband has come to see his wife at her morning toilette; she directs his attention towards their daughter, whose hair she is adorning; the child has just presented flowers to her mother, in accordance with the tradition of gift-giving on April 1st (the date is inscribed on the bandbox at lower right). From the perspective of the standard account outlined above, such informality and intimacy are all the more striking in the light of the painting's relatively early date, such that it is often seen as anticipating the subsequent establishment of a new domestic ideology.⁷⁹

Moreover, in a classic essay inspired by Ariès, Carol Duncan contends that Drouais's portrait shows that 'real families' embraced 'the new concept of conjugal love and family harmony'. Thus, she concludes, 'did bourgeois concepts penetrate aristocratic culture'.⁸⁰ However, Duncan's assumption about the sitters' social status and the conclusion that she draws from it are both belied by Drouais's portrait of the marquis de Sourches and his family, painted the same year (Plate 12). These indubitably aristocratic sitters are shown not in a domestic interior but an ornate park, from which they stare out at the viewer; wearing pastoral fancy dress and holding instruments such as they might have played in amateur theatricals at Versailles, they appear the very embodiment of courtly culture.⁸¹ By contrast, the undocumented portrait most probably depicts a wealthy family of relatively humble origins. Drouais seems to have based his composition on Nattier's portrait of Mme Marsollier, the wife of a rich draper (that is, textile merchant), seated at her dressing table with her daughter. Redolent of court ritual, the portrait at the toilette functioned as a statement of social aspiration on the part of a status-conscious sitter.⁸² As well as suggesting that couple are not of noble birth, this style of portrait embodies an increasingly contested model of femininity. Rousseau, for example, deplored the central role of the toilette in a fashionable woman's life, insisting that young girls should be taught not to care too much about adornment, but to be modest and to know how to manage a household.⁸³ The painting thus looks backward as much as forward.

What is novel is Drouais' introduction of an authoritative male presence into a type of interior space that had hitherto been depicted as predominantly feminine.⁸⁴ By showing the father holding a letter, he effectively incorporates into the toilette scene a standard type of male portraiture; a document in a sitter's hand served to identify him as someone other than a traditional nobleman, typically a financier, a merchant or an official. Such men were also often shown seated at a desk, as in Jacques-André-Joseph Aved's portrait of Marc de Villiers, a high-ranking official in the finance ministry (and a *secrétaire du roi*), who holds a book in one hand and, like his counterpart in Drouais' painting, wears a sumptuous dressing gown.⁸⁵ The latter can thus be imagined to have risen from the desk in another room where he has been working (it is already 11.17 by the clock on the wall) to attend his wife's toilette; standing behind her chair, he looks down with proprietary satisfaction. Given the opulence of the setting and accessories, he is most some kind of financier, perhaps a *fermier-général*.⁸⁶ As with other family portraits, the commission was probably prompted by some specific circumstance, such as the acquisition of noble status or similar distinction. Whatever the precise circumstances, the painting functions to demonstrate that the sitters' wealth and consequence are well-deserved by characterizing them as loving, virtuous and united, just as Diderot described La Rochefoucauld household, thereby providing a moral justification for

what would otherwise appear a purely selfish luxury, something of which financiers were regularly accused.

Closer to the domestic tableau outlined by Diderot or the *matinée à l'anglaise*, however, is Louis-Michel Van Loo's 1767 portrait of the family of Jacques-Julien Devin (Plate 13). Rather than taking the wife's toilette as the focus of the composition, as Drouais did, Van Loo accords an equivalent role to the husband's professional duties by depicting him at his writing desk; a brief case lying on a large folio volume effectively replaces the band box in the earlier painting. As Dena Goodman has observed, this type of desk, known as a *bureau plat*, was not only a specifically masculine piece of furniture but also 'the mark of the man who had moved up in the world'.⁸⁷ Devin had certainly done so. His father, Jacques-René, sold his drapery business and, bought his children's way into the official class known as the *noblesse de robe*, purchasing the office of *secrétaire du roi* for Jacques-Julien in 1754.⁸⁸ Van Loo endows him with an air of thoughtful gravity by showing him leaning his hand against his hand, as he looks up from his work to gaze at his wife and son, who, somewhat improbably, are seated in close proximity to him. Rather than sharing a real domestic space, the couple symbolically occupy distinct gendered realms, indicated by the austere grey panelling and the warm yellow drapery against which they are respectively seen. His masculine diligence finds an appropriate feminine counterpart in her embroidery; the defining activity of the domestic woman, as already seen, it features in female portraits such as that by Aved of Mme Crozat, the wife of a great financier.⁸⁹ Its significance lay in the way that it transformed humble, functional needlework into an elegant leisure pursuit, while still retaining connotations of virtuous industry.

In all of these respects, Van Loo's portrait of the Devin family has a legitimating function; the painting defies the traditional stereotype of the crass, grasping bourgeois parvenu by asserting their virtue and taste.⁹⁰ At the same time, it leaves no doubt as to their wealth, of which Mme Devin's fur-edged silk dress and necklace of huge pearls provide the most obvious testimony; the bracelet on her wrist additionally testifies to her role as a dutiful wife, since it contains a portrait of (presumably) her husband.⁹¹ The social ascent to which the painting attests followed an established pattern, out of the commercial bourgeoisie into the *noblesse de robe*, for both Jacques-Julien and his wife, Élisabeth Rousseau, daughter of a Sedan textile manufacturer. Their son Jean-Jacques, shown looking at his mother as he takes a mint from his father's desk, would have been expected to continue the trajectory, as he did, becoming a councillor in the Paris Parlement in 1781.⁹² Strikingly, however, no reference is made to the traditional structures of power; we find here no portrait of the king as a sign of royal favour, no park setting to indicate noble landownership or dressing table to evoke the courtly ritual of the toilette. Instead, in his sombre black attire relieved by fine lace and his elaborate lawyer's wig, Jacques-Julien appears a conscientious public servant, one whose upright character is confirmed by his evident attachment to his wife and son.⁹³ Since his brother-in-law Clément-Charles-François de L'Averdy was *Contrôleur-général des finances* at the time, there was every reason to hope to that the future head of the Devin family would reap the benefit of such a connection by being appointed to public office himself. In other words, the picture functioned strategically to attest to his fitness for such a position.⁹⁴

More generally, the Devin family portrait seeks to consolidate their social ascent by evincing the sitters' exemplary private life and, by implication, their contribution to the public good. In Habermasian terms, it validates them within the ideological framework not of the representative publicness of feudal lordship, but of the bourgeois public sphere.⁹⁵ Of course, as already seen, this type of portrait could also function to assert a similar claim on behalf of

a royal or ducal family and do so, moreover, within the public forum of the Salon whereas Van Loo's painting would have been seen only by visitors to the Devin residence in the Marais. However, such a wealthy but otherwise obscure family had no particular need to win over public opinion as a whole and may have calculated that exhibiting an elaborate portrait commissioned at vast expense from a renowned artist would expose them to the risk of critical derision for ostentation and vanity.⁹⁶ Moreover, unlike members of the hereditary ruling elite, the Devins did not need to take an interest in political economy to prove their commitment to the general good, because they themselves participated in public authority, with direct responsibility for matters of national interest. The crucial figure in this respect was not Jacques-Julien, however, but Jacques-René who, in 1767, was appointed a director of the *Caisse d'Escompte*, a forerunner of the *Banque de France*, by his son-in law, L'Averdy. It may well have been Devin senior, owner of a substantial art collection, who commissioned the portrait of his son's family, in anticipation of the latter too receiving an official appointment, as indeed transpired, since Jacques-Julien became a president of the *Chambre des Comptes*, a sovereign court dealing with financial matters, in 1768.⁹⁷

On the evidence of Van Loo's painting, it would thus seem that the family portrait in the guise of a domestic tableau functioned to legitimate distinctively bourgeois, fundamentally commercial, values and interests. Such a claim derives further support from another portrait of the same type, that by Nicolas-Bernard Lépicié of Marc-Étienne Quatremère and his family, which is often taken to exemplify the growing emphasis on intimacy and informality (Plate 15).⁹⁸ Like the Marsolliers and Devins, the Quatremères were drapers by trade. All three belonged to a tightly integrated, much intermarried network of merchant families, who formed the elite of the Parisian bourgeoisie; as drapers, they were members of the most prestigious of the great merchant guilds known as the Six Corps, which had dominated the commercial life of the city until they were reformed in 1776.⁹⁹ Contrary to 'revisionist' claims that traditional distinctions between nobles and commoners had become blurred by this date, these families retained their distinct identity even as they acquired noble rank and land. In 1780, for example, Nicolas-Étienne Quatremère and his descendants were ennobled on condition that one son would carry on the family business, recognized to be of public benefit; this was the eldest, Marc-Étienne, whom Lépicié painted with his wife and daughters the same year.¹⁰⁰ Clad in a silk dressing gown, like his counterpart in Drouais's portrait, Quatremère is seen seated beside his wife at their morning coffee (note the tray on the table); he appears a thoroughly bourgeois figure, not least in his role as the doting father of two little girls, as would hardly be conceivable for a nobleman but accords with the equal inheritance rights of all children among merchant families.¹⁰¹

More broadly, Lépicié's portrait of the Quatremère family can be seen to embody a new style of tender and involved fatherhood, which is conventionally associated with the influence of Rousseau but had in fact become a widespread cultural phenomenon by the mid 1770s.¹⁰² As Monnet's painting of the Dauphin with his youngest son on his knee demonstrates, the new-style father was by no means a straightforwardly enlightened figure, but could be a devout Christian, as indeed Quatremère was. More precisely, he was a Jansenist and, as such, representative of an austere current of piety that had exercised great sway over the Parisian bourgeoisie for decades. As recent scholarship has shown, Jansenism played a vital role in forging the merchant families' collective identity as a moral and spiritual community; it also defined them in opposition to the monarchy, which regarded it as a rival source of authority that it ought to be repressed. At a time when most of the original fervour had faded, Marc-Étienne was distinguished by a militant Jansenism, which, though broadly compatible with the public-spirited concerns of his more secular-minded contemporaries, was to lead to his

execution during the Revolution.¹⁰³ He shared his intense piety with Lépicié, who not only inscribed the canvas with a dedication to his friend, but had previously painted a picture of a family called Leroy, almost certainly the deeply devout Jansenist drapers of that name who were related to the Quatremères. Exhibited at the Salon of 1767, the composition centres on a priest reading from the bible, in accordance with the central role of the family in the propagation of Jansenist beliefs and practices.¹⁰⁴

Unlike the earlier painting, however, Lépicié's portrait of the Quatremère family was not exhibited; it is also on a much smaller scale and was presumably only ever intended to be viewed by a select group of fellow Jansenists. Few such pictures were in fact seen at the Salon after 1767, perhaps because of the largely negative response to earlier examples. In any case, family portraits were increasingly being painted by artists who did not belong to the Academy and so were not entitled to exhibit their work. Even for quite wealthy patrons, the cost of commissioning a complex portrait with several sitters from an academician is likely to have been prohibitive; Diderot reported that Roslin's painting of the La Rochefoucauld family had cost 15,000 francs. Instead, they might turn to less established artists, such as Henri-Pierre Danloux, who painted several family portraits in the 1780s; in each case, the sitters, like the Devins and Quatremères, possessed substantial fortunes of recent origin that had enabled them to acquire official posts, noble status and country houses.¹⁰⁵ However, as Bordes shows in his 'portraiture in the mode of genre' essay, princes of royal blood also employed non-academicians for this purpose, albeit for rather different reasons. Their family portraits can also be seen to be shaped by the quest for public legitimation, not least because the most genre-like of them were commissioned by the duc de Chartres, the future Philippe-Égalité, who consistently deployed images of himself in exemplary roles as part of a calculated political strategy, making use of the medium of print to ensure that they circulated widely. Nevertheless, they are not domestic tableaux in the same way as those by Drouais, Van Loo or Lépicié, since none of these princely family portraits depicts a group consisting only of family members, including young children, engaged in their daily routine.¹⁰⁶

Conclusion

As already noted, the term, 'un tableau de famille', first appears in the Salon *livret* in 1737. It does not reappear, however, until 1767, when it was applied to Lépicié's portrait of the Leroy family and one by Guillaume Voiriot of Pierre de Parseval, a *fermier-général*, with his wife and children.¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, by this date, this type of picture not merely seems to have become a familiar concept, but also to have found popular favour, at least to judge from Diderot's disgruntled response to these two paintings; he complained in his review of the Salon of 1767 that the public was enthralled by a 'wretched family picture', while remaining indifferent to a masterpiece.¹⁰⁸ Despite their very different perspectives, Diderot's observation provides support for Rousseau's claim that 'there is no picture more charming than that of the family', insofar as both suggest that a family portrait was generally regarded to have an inherent fascination, regardless of the identity of the sitters or the manner in which they are depicted. No further painting thus designated was seen at the Salon until 1787, however, when Antoine Vestier exhibited a family portrait now said to depict M. Chabanel, a tax farmer, his wife (née d'Adhémar), sister, Mme Paulet, and niece (Plate 15). In this case, the title was followed by a detailed explanation: '*Family Picture. M. *** seated at a desk, extends a hand to his wife who leans on his shoulder, and, with the other, draws her attention to his sister, who is occupied, in the background, with her child, who reaches towards the portrait of her grandfather*'.¹⁰⁹ In other words, the artist had taken to heart the demand to unify this type of composition by showing the figures engaged in some action.

More specifically, as with Van Loo's portrait of the Devin family, Vestier takes the husband's desk as the organizing principle of his composition, thereby characterizing him as a man dedicated to his professional duties and, by implication, the public good. He also follows Drouais in depicting the domestic routine of a seated figure being interrupted by a spouse, with the difference that it is here the wife, who adopts the standing pose behind the chair usually allocated to men.¹¹⁰ The artist conveys a heightened sense of domestic intimacy by showing the sitters in close physical proximity, as Lépicié does, though in this case the wife rests one hand on the husband's shoulder while he clasps her other one. At the same time, the painting testifies to a continued concern with lineage since the composition includes lineal relatives, in the form of the sister and niece, together with a portrait-within-a-portrait of the male head of the line. Nevertheless, in dramatizing the child's recognition of her grandfather and the response that it elicits from the adult members of the family, the composition calls attention to his absence, such that traditional dynastic structures are infused with a new commitment to maintaining affective bonds even at a distance.¹¹¹ In the absence of reliable information about the sitters, it is impossible to establish any definite reason why the portrait might have been commissioned, but the very complexity of the scenario suggests that, as with other such pictures, its origins lay in a particular set of circumstances, which it was designed in some way to transcend. The reason may have had something to do with couple's childlessness; it is possible too that they were concerned to demonstrate their attachment to the head of the line in order to secure an inheritance, whether for themselves or the little girl.

In the context of the Salon, of course, what mattered was whether or not Vestier had succeeded in presenting a dramatically coherent and emotionally convincing evocation of family life. Most of the critics judged that he had. One review, written in the voice of a fictional *bourgeoise*, offered the following endorsement: 'I warrant all these people look like themselves; one can guess what they are saying'.¹¹² Although the use of such figures as a mouthpiece was a standard comic device, the attribution of this statement to a representative of the *bourgeoisie* was clearly not arbitrary. It is this class that provides the standard for assessing the authenticity (or otherwise) of a domestic scene, with reference not just to the private identities thus displayed but also to the material markers of comfort and status; the *bourgeoise* goes on to assert her authority as a judge of taste.¹¹³ In practice, as has been shown, the family portrait that evokes the affective bonds between the sitters whilst also setting them within the luxurious yet dutiful practice of their everyday life was a distinctively bourgeois phenomenon. To a great extent, however, the same can be said of the family portrait as such, functioning as it had done from the outset for purposes of legitimation. The crucial point is that, while princes and nobles might exceptionally seek to validate their authority, whether in response to a dynastic crisis or (increasingly) in order to exploit a political opportunity, a bourgeois family who had risen in the world always needed to justify their new status, even if it seems primarily to have been art collectors, artists' friends and relations and artists themselves who chose to do so by means of a family portrait.

Whether or not it was ever seen outside a domestic setting, a family portrait was addressed to an outsider, the public at large, whose endorsement it sought to elicit by marshalling the evidence in the sitters' favour. Devices such as the portrait-within-a-portrait and pointing finger seen in early examples served to draw attention to the presence of authority, typically embodied by the father in his capacity as a royal servant, office holder or academician, or by the king himself, thereby demonstrating that the family had already been endorsed by a higher power. From the first, however, it was possible that the sitters' claim to respect might also derive from those lower down in the domestic hierarchy, who therefore become a rival centre of attention, as the young princes do in Mignard's portrait of the Dauphin's family and

as Mme Mercier does in Dumont's portrait of her family. Over the course of the century, the gradual shift of authority towards the public sphere meant that it became more important to demonstrate that the sitters shared the public's own concerns and interests. Although the patriarchal order remained fundamentally unchallenged, the effect was to endow the wife and children with a new prominence, the whole composition now serving to engage the viewer's sympathy and approval by celebrating the sitters' happiness and virtue. In short, the acknowledged charm (in short, the human interest) of this type of picture was exploited in order to convince the public that the head of the family was a truly public-spirited citizen.¹¹⁴ Even so, family portraits failed to fulfil Rousseau's prescriptions in one crucial respect; though in evidence in a few mother-and-child portraits of the period, maternal breast-feeding remains conspicuously absent from such pictures before 1789.

Illustrations



1. Charles Le Brun, *Everhard Jabach and his Family*, c. 1660. Oil on canvas, 280 × 328 cm. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.



2. Pierre Mignard, *The Family of the Grand Dauphin*, 1687. Oil on canvas, 232 x 304 cm. Musée National du Château de Versailles.



3. Nicolas de Largillière, *The Marquise de Noailles and her Children*, 1698. Oil on canvas, 64 x 81 cm. Private collection.



4. Jacques Dumont, *Marie-Madeleine Mercier and her Family*, 1731. Oil on canvas, 225 x 380 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris.



5. Robert Le Vrac Tournières, *Nicolas Delaunay and his Family*, 1704. Oil on canvas, 56 x 70.2 cm. Musée des Beaux-Arts, Caen.



6. Nicolas de Largillière, *Family Portrait*, first quarter of the eighteenth century (?) Oil on canvas, 149 x 200 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris.



7. Jean-Marc Nattier, *The Artist and his Family*, 1730-1762. Oil on canvas, 142.5 x 163 cm. Musée National du Château de Versailles



8. Louis-Michel Van Loo, *Carle Van Loo and his Family*, 1757. Oil on canvas, 200 x 156 cm. Musée National du Château de Versailles.



9. Jean-Jacques Flipart after Hubert Gravelot, *La Matinée à l'Anglaise*, illustration to *Julie ou la nouvelle Héloïse*, 1761. Etching finished with engraving, 13.3 x 8.5 cm. Bibliothèque nationale, Paris.



10. Louis Lagrenée, *Monseigneur the Dauphin dying, Surrounded by his Family*, 1767.
Oil on canvas, 129 x 97 cm. Musée du Château, Fontainebleau.



11. François-Hubert Drouais, *Family Portrait*, 1756. Oil on canvas, 244 x 195 cm. National Gallery of Art, Washington.



12. François-Hubert Drouais, *The Marquis de Sourches and his Family*, 1756. Oil on canvas, 324 x 224 cm. Musée National du Château de Versailles.



13. Louis-Michel Van Loo, *Jacques-Julien Devin and his Family*, 1767. Oil on canvas, 110 x 150 cm. Formerly Los Angeles County Museum.



14. Nicolas-Bernard Lépicié, *Marc-Étienne Quatremère and his Family*, 1780. Oil on canvas, 53 x 62 cm. Musée du Louvre, Paris.



15. Antoine Vestier, *Portrait of the Chabanel Family*, 1786. Oil on canvas, 162 x 230 cm. Private Collection.

I would particularly like to thank Jennie Batchelor for the invitation to speak that prompted the initial research for this essay, Melissa Hyde for her incisive and generous criticism of an earlier draft, and Kate Retford for bringing her expertise on British family portraiture to bear on the text.

¹ J.-J. Rousseau, *Emile or on Education*, trans. Allan Bloom, London, 1991, 46, 49 (translation amended).

² See, for example, *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1694), 2: 523; Jacques Lacombe, *Dictionnaire portatif des beaux-arts*, Paris, 1752, 623-4; Louis de Jaucourt, 'Tableau', *Encyclopédie ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers*, 15 vols (Paris, 1751-65), 15: 804.

³ Suzanne R. Pucci, 'Snapshots of Family Intimacy in the French Eighteenth Century: the Case of Paul et Virginie', *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture*, 37, 2008, 90-2.

⁴ See below for examples. Compare Jean-Baptiste Descamps, *La Vie des peintres flamands, allemands et hollandais*, 4 vols, vol. 1 (1753), 96; vol. 3 (1760), 226; and vol. 4 (1763), 208. Generic family groups were typically described by such terms as 'moral painting' or 'scenes of private life'; see Emma Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment*, Cambridge, 2005, 75, 146.

⁵ Salon of 1704 (no number); Salon of 1775, no. 163.

⁶ A. J. Dézallier d'Argenville, *Abrégé de la vie des plus fameux Peintres*, Paris, 1752, I, 264. See also Michèle-Caroline Heck and Guillaume Faroult, *Jean Raoux, 1677-1743: un peintre sous la Régence*, Paris, 2009, 7-18.

⁷ See Kate Retford, *The Art of Domestic Life: Family Portraiture in Eighteenth-Century England*, New Haven and London, 2006.

⁸ Amy Freund, *Portraiture and Politics in Revolutionary France*, University Park, PA., 2014, 203-6, 259, note 6 (citing Louis Hautecoeur, *Les Peintres de la vie familiale. Évolution d'un thème*, Paris, 1945). Freund's account in fact differs in significant respects from Hautecoeur's pre-Ariès work.

⁹ Philippe Bordes, 'Portraiture in the mode of genre: a social interpretation', in Philip Conisbee, ed., *French Genre Painting in the Eighteenth Century*, New Haven and London, 2007, 259, 268.

¹⁰ See Anthony Burton. 'Looking Forward from Ariès? Pictorial and Material Evidence for the History of Childhood and Family Life', *Continuity and Change* 4:2 1989, 203-229. See also Patrick Hutton, *Philippe Ariès and the Politics of French Cultural History*, Amherst and Boston, 2004, 92-112.

¹¹ Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood*, 43-44. Of course, the studio photograph as a criterion of modernity itself now seems problematic.

¹² In a path-breaking article, for example, Carol Duncan cited Ariès as her principal authority but ignored his chronology and his examples; see Duncan, 'Happy Mothers and Other New Ideas in French Art', *Art Bulletin*, 55:4, 1973, 570-583.

¹³ Orest Ranum, 'Intimacy in French eighteenth-century family portraits', *Word & Image*, 16: 4, 1990, 354, 352. In this respect, they exemplify the memorial function of portraiture as such, on which see Édouard Pommier, *Théories du portrait: de la renaissance aux Lumières*, Paris, 1998, 44-5. Their inclusion of busts and medallions certainly seems to derive from tomb sculpture, on which see Florence Ingersoll-Smouse, *La Sculpture funéraire en France aux XVIII siècle*, Paris, 1912.

¹⁴ For a comparable argument, see Ann Jensen Adams, *Public faces and Private Identities in Seventeenth-Century Holland: Portraiture and the Production of Community*, Cambridge, 2008, 113-57.

¹⁵ Jürgen Habermas, *The structural transformation of the public sphere*, Cambridge, MA, 1989, 27-31, 43-51. For a fuller development of this argument, see Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment*, 13-18.

¹⁶ On this transfer of political authority, see Keith Michael Baker, *Inventing the French Revolution: Essays on French Political Culture in the Eighteenth Century*, Cambridge, 1990, esp. 171-2.

¹⁷ Sarah Maza, 'The "Bourgeois" Family Revisited: Sentimentalism and Social Class in Prerevolutionary French Culture', in Richard Rand, ed., *Intimate Encounters: Love and Domesticity in Eighteenth-Century France*, Princeton, 1997, 39-48

¹⁸ S. P. Mazière de Monville, *La Vie de Pierre Mignard, premier peintre du roi*, Amsterdam, 1731, 137. See also Roger de Piles, *Abrégé de la vie des plus fameux peintres*, Paris, 1699, 525.

¹⁹ Such precedents as did exist differed in their more overtly allegorical and dynastic character, as with Jacob Van Loo's now lost portrait of the family of Louis XIV, for which see David Mandrella, *Jacob Van Loo 1614-1670*, Paris, 2011, 38-9, 193 no *P. 128. Mignard had previously painted a portrait of the diplomat Hugues de Lionne and his family; see Monville, *Vie de Mignard*, 42. An unattributed portrait of the Lionne family is now in the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, Paris (PE 20).

²⁰ He was on friendly terms with Jabach; see E.H. de Grouchy, 'Éverhard Jabach: collectionneur parisien (1695).'" *Mémoires de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris et de L'Ile-de-France* 21 (1894), 233, 242-43, 281 (no. 647).

²¹ L. F. Dubois De Saint-Gelais, *Description des tableaux du Palais Royal*, Paris, 1727, 67-8; Hélène Adhémar, 'Mignard, portraitiste de Jacques II', *Bulletin de la société Poussin*, 3rd cahier, May 1950, 64-72.

²² Julia Marciari Alexander, 'Portraiture and royal family ties: kings, queens, princes, and princesses in Caroline England', in Naomi J. Miller and Naomi Yavneh, eds, *Gender and early modern constructions of childhood*, Farnham, 2011, 209-21.

²³ Ariès, *Centuries of Childhood*, 44.

²⁴ See Philippe Salvadori, *La chasse sous l'ancien régime*, Paris, 1996, 170, 196, 199-201, 223, 237-9.

²⁵ Quoted in Monville, *Vie de Mignard*, 137. These words seem to anticipate Louis XIV's subsequent efforts to secure French hegemony in Europe by placing the duc d'Anjou on the Spanish throne

²⁶ See François Bluche, *Dictionnaire du Grand Siècle*, 2nd edn, Paris: 2005, 596: 'fistule'.

²⁷ Emmanuel Le Roy Ladurie, *Saint-Simon and the court of Louis XIV*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer, Chicago, 2001, 136-9; Marc Fumaroli, *The Poet and the King: Jean de la Fontaine and his Century*, trans. Jane Marie Todd, Notre Dame, Ind., 2002, 34, 390-2, 402.

²⁸ Thierry Bajou, 'À propos de quelques tableaux de Pierre Mignard conservés aux château de Versailles', in Jean-Claude Boyer, ed., *Pierre Mignard 'le Romain'*, Paris, 1997, 198. On Meudon, see Mathieu Lahaye, *Le Fils de Louis XIV: Monseigneur le Grand Dauphin (1661-1711)*, Paris, 2013, 309-40,

²⁹ *Mercurie galant*, April 1689, 265-67. A medallion of the king on the wall appears both in a preliminary sketch and another print after the painting; see Bajou, *Paintings at Versailles*, 212; Pierre Rosenberg, ed., *Le cabinet d'un amateur: Georges de Lastic (1927-1988): collectionneur et conservateur*, Paris, 2011. 130-3, No. 31.

³⁰ He claims that it was the first French royal family portrait to discard allegory, see Simon Schama, 'The Domestication of Majesty: Royal Family Portraiture, 1500-1850', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 17: 1, 1986, 167. For an earlier example of such domestication (significantly in engraved form); see Eugène Bouvy, 'La Famille d'Henri IV à propos d'une estampe de Léonard Gaultier', *L'Amateur d'Estampe*, 1932, 161-176.

³¹ On Jabach as collector, see Antoine Schnapper, *Curieux du Grand Siècle*, Paris, 1994, 267-81. For his friendship with Le Brun, see Claude Nivelon, *Vie de Charles Le Brun et description détaillée de ses ouvrages*, ed. Lorenzo Pericolo, Geneva, 2004, 240.

³² On the Dauphin as collector, see Stéphane Castelluccio, *Les Collections royales d'objets d'art, de François I à la Révolution*, Paris, 2002, 135-76. On the political significance of his connoisseurship, see Georgia J. Cowart, *The Triumph of Pleasure: Louis XIV and the Politics of Spectacle*, Chicago, 2008, 143-4.

³³ The mid 1680s saw significant developments in the public image of the king; see Peter Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV*, New Haven and London, 1992, 91-7. These can be attributed to growing pressures on the monarchy, at home (with the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685) and abroad (with the formation of the League of Augsburg in 1686).

³⁴ See Emmanuel Coquerey et al, *Visages du Grand Siècle: Le portrait français sous le règne de Louis XIV*, Paris, 2000, 121-7; Erica M. Harth, *Ideology and Culture in Seventeenth-Century France*, Ithaca, 1983, 83-90, 109-11.

³⁵ Dominique Brême, *Nicolas de Largillière (1656-1746)*, Paris, 2003, 154, no. 49. His interpolated presence allows it to count as a family portrait. Compare Pierre Gobert's *Famille du duc de Valentinois* (Salon of 1737; Grimaldi Collection, Monaco), which shows the duke (who had been forced to abdicate as Prince of Monaco in 1733 after his wife's death) and his late wife, Louise-

Hippolyte Grimaldi, in a portrait above their children's heads. See J.H. Lalande, *Les Portraits des Princes et Princesses de Monaco exécutés par Pierre Gobert*, Monaco, 1908, 97-103.

³⁶ Hal Opperman, *Jean-Baptiste Oudry*, New York and London, 1977, 634-35, D77 (compositional sketch for lost painting). See also Louis de Rouvroy, duc de Saint-Simon, *Mémoires*, ed. Yves Coirault, Paris, vol. 5 (1985), 283ff and vol. 6 (1986), 240-2; Le Roy Ladurie, *Saint-Simon*, 269; Leonhard Horowski, 'Le Duc de Noailles est le premier homme du monde', paper delivered at the Institute of Historical Research, London, November 2011.

³⁷ Jean Cordey, 'Oudry, Peintre de la famille de Noailles', *Bulletin de l'histoire de l'art français*, 1921 166-171. The duke was a close friend of Henri, duc de Boulainvilliers, the ideologist of noble power.

³⁸ For the governess portrait, see John Ingamells, *The Wallace Collection: Catalogue of Pictures*, vol. 3: *French before 1815* (London, 1989), 170-75, P 122. On the role of royal governess, see Kathryn Norberg, 'Women of Versailles 1680-1789', in Anne Walthall, ed., *Servants of the Dynasty: Palace Women in World History*, Berkeley and London, 2008, 196-7, 203.

³⁹ Odile Caffin-Caffey, 'Marie-Madeleine Mercier, nourrice de Louis XV, et sa famille', *La Revue des musées de France/Revue du Louvre*, 58: 1, 2008, 64-72.

⁴⁰ Despite its modest dimensions, Largillière's Noailles family portrait cost 1600 livres (as compared to 40 livres for a single half-length); see Georges de Lastic, 'Nicolas de Largillière: documents notariés inédits', *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, 98, July-August 1981, 2, 13.

⁴¹ *Robert le Vrac Tournières: Les facettes d'un portraitiste*, Heule: Snoek, 2014.

⁴² Daniel Alcouffe, 'Notes sur un portrait de Tournières, "Nicolas Delaunay et sa famille"', *Revue du Louvre et des musées de France*, 29: 5-6, 1979, 444-48; Coquerey, *Visages du Grand Siècle*, Paris, 2000, 249, no. 100.

⁴³ See Anatole de Montaiglon, *Procès-verbaux de l'Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture, 1648-1792*, vol. 3, Paris, 1880, 359-60.; Schnapper, *Curieux*, 404-6.

⁴⁴ See Stéphane Perreau, *Hyacinthe Rigaud, 1659-1743: le peintre des rois*, Montpellier, 2004 26-7, 64-5, 68-9. They depict his sister's family, his future wife's and that of the royal printer, who, being based in the Louvre, Rigaud would surely have known.

⁴⁵ Georges de Lastic 'Largillière et ses modèles, problèmes d'iconographie', *L'Oeil*, 323, 1982, 78. Another painting more plausibly said to be a self-portrait with his wife, daughter (born 1701) and son (born 1704), dateable to c. 1705, is now in the Kunsthalle, Bremen. For an engraving, dated 1687, of a family group, said by George Vertue to be Largillière's own, in a landscape, see Antony Griffiths, *The Print in Stuart England*, London, 1998, no. 163.

⁴⁶ Compare Alexis Belle's *Mme de Sablonnière and her Daughter* (Musée des Beaux-Arts, Pau). See also Claude d'Anthenaise, *Portraits en costume de chasse*, Paris, 2010, 53-4, 67-91

⁴⁷ For another example of the portrait of the artist's own family, exhibited in 1737, see Marianne Roland Michel, *Lajoue et l'art rocaille*, Paris, 1984, 233-4, P256.

-
- ⁴⁸ Xavier Salmon, *Jean-Marc Nattier, 1685-1766*, Paris, 1999, 293-6, no. 97; Hannah Williams, *Académie Royale: A History in Portraits*, Aldershot, 2015, 190-2, 198-99.
- ⁴⁹ Diderot, *Oeuvres complètes*, 25 vols. (Paris, 1975-), vol. 13: *Arts et Lettres (1739–1766): Critique I*, Jean Varloot et al, eds. (1980), 358.
- ⁵⁰ Salon of 1746, no. 26 bis. Étienne Jollet, ed., *La Font de Saint-Yenne Oeuvre critique*, Paris, 2001, 81. For its presence in the 1725 Salon (with the artist's name misprinted as Raymond Tourmire), see *Mercure de France*, September 1725, 2261. It can be identified with a surviving painting by Tournières showing eighteen figures; see Claire Gérin-Pierre and Corinne Diserens, *Catalogue des peintures françaises XVIIe-XVIIIe siècle*, Nantes, 2005, 191 no. 217. For previous criticism of his work, see *Lettre à M. Poiresson-Charamade*, Paris 1741, 17-18.
- ⁵¹ Salon of 1757, no. 4 ; Williams, *Académie Royale*, 180-3 ; *Année littéraire*, 1757, vol. 5, 342; *Correspondance littéraire, philosophique et critique, par Grimm, Diderot, Raynal* (etc.), ed. M. Tourneux, 16 vols (Paris, 1877-82), vol. 3 (1878), 432. Louis-Michel clearly regarded the portrait as a manifesto statement of his talents since he took it with him to London when he tried his luck there, exhibiting it at the Society of Artists in 1765; see Hugh Gatty, 'Notes by Horace Walpole, Earl of Orford, on the Exhibitions of the Society of Artists and the Free Society of Artists, 1760–1791', *Walpole Society* 27 (1938-39), 80.
- ⁵² Marie H. Trope-Podell, "Portraits historiés" et portraits collectifs dans la critique du XVIIIe siècle', *Revue de l'art*, 109 (1995), 40-46.
- ⁵³ Thomas E. Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris*, New Haven and London, 1985, 7-15.
- ⁵⁴ Jean Locquin, 'Le Lutte des critiques d'art contre les portraitistes au XVIIIe siècle', *Archives de l'art français*, new period, 7, 1913, 309-20 ; Pommier, *Théories du portrait*, 314-33.
- ⁵⁵ *Mercure de France*, October 1757, vol. 2, 157.
- ⁵⁶ See Diderot, *Arts et Lettres (1739–1766): Critique I*, 350-54. His remarks were prompted by Van Loo's portrait of himself and his sister in front of a portrait of their late father; see *Diderot et l'art de Boucher à David*, Paris, 1984, 384-8, no. 114.
- ⁵⁷ Christian Ludwig von Hagedorn, *Réflexions sur la peinture*, Leipzig, 1775, 397, 428-9 (in the original German, only Destouches is mentioned, though Diderot is named a few sentences earlier).
- ⁵⁸ See Jay Caplan, *Framed Narratives: Diderot's Genealogy of the Beholder*, Minnesota, 1985; Pierre Frantz, *L'Esthétique du tableau dans le théâtre du XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, 1998.
- ⁵⁹ Salon of 1765, no. 77; Gunnar W. Lundberg, *Roslin, liv och verk*, 3 vols, Malmö, 1957, vol. 1, 87, vol. 3, 41-2, no. 209 (as private French collection). The composition can be seen at an angle in Gabriel de Saint-Aubin's watercolour of the Salon of 1765 (Louvre 32749).
- ⁶⁰ Daniel Vaugelade, *Le salon physiocratique des La Rochefoucauld : animé par Louise Elisabeth de La Rochefoucauld duchesse d'Enville, 1716-1797*, Paris, 2007, 25-6, 32-3.
- ⁶¹ Diderot, *Arts et Lettres (1739–1766)*, 143.

⁶² One critic applauded the effort made to avoid the monotony of portraits, though he also deplored the lack of warmth in Roslin's composition; see C. J. Mathon de La Cour, *Troisième lettre a Monsieur *** sur les peintures, les sculptures et les gravures exposées au Salon du Louvre en 1765* (Paris, 1765), 13.

⁶³ Diderot, *Arts et Lettres* (1739–1766), 144-5.

⁶⁴ See Julie Candler Hayes, *Identity and Ideology: Diderot, Sade, and the serious genre*, Amsterdam, 1991, 85, 99-101.

⁶⁵ Rousseau, *Julie ou La nouvelle Héloïse*, ed. R. Pomeau (Paris, 1960), cviii, 543. Stéphane Lojkin, *L'Oeil révolté: Les Salons de Diderot*, Paris, 2007, 311.

⁶⁶ Marquis de Girardin to François d'Ivernois, 1 June 1779, letter 7554 of *Correspondance complète de Jean- Jacques Rousseau: janvier–août 1779*, ed. R. A. Leigh. Oxford, 1965–1998; vol. 43 (1984), 307–310.

⁶⁷ Vaugelade, *Le salon physiocratique*, 15, 30-1

⁶⁸ Diderot, *Arts et Lettres* (1739–1766), 45.

⁶⁹ He seems never to have painted a family portrait at all. Although his painting, *The Beloved Mother*, is often said to depict the banker Jean-Joseph de Laborde and his family, there is no firm evidence to support such a claim; see Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment*, Cambridge, 2005, 91-4.

⁷⁰ Salon of 1767, no. 83. Diderot, *Oeuvres complètes*, vol. 16 (1990): *Salon de 1767, Salon de 1769*, ed. Else Marie Bukdahl, Michel Delon and Annette Lorenceau, 149. See also *Diderot et l'art de Boucher à David*, 289-95, no. 83.

⁷¹ Diderot sought to avoid any such incoherence in the ideas he submitted for the Dauphin's tomb in Sens cathedral; see Erika Naginski, *Sculpture and Enlightenment*, Los Angeles, CA, 2009, 93-161.

⁷² J.A.J. Cérutti and Quelen de Stuer de Caussade de la Vauguyon, *Portrait de feu Monseigneur le Dauphin*, 1766. See Hours, *La vertu et le secret*, 75-6; Pascale Mormiche, *Devenir prince: l'école du pouvoir en France, XVIIe-XVIIIe siècles*, Paris, 2009, 92--3, 96-7.

⁷³ Salon of 1771, no.171; for a description, see *Les Salons des "Mémoires secrets" 1767-1787*, ed., Bernadette Fort, Paris, 1999, 83-4. A study was sold at Tajan, 28 November 2002, lot 82.

⁷⁴ Joël Félix, *Louis XVI et Marie-Antoinette : un couple en politique*, Paris, 2006, 28-39; Mormiche, *Devenir Prince*, 97-9.

⁷⁵ Diderot, *Salons*, ed. Jean Adhémar and Jean Seznec, 4 vols (Oxford, 1957-67): vol. 4: *1769, 1771, 1775, 1781*, 206-7.

⁷⁶ This event was reported in the press and commemorated in a print; see John Shovlin, *The Political Economy of Virtue: Luxury, Patriotism, and the Origins of the French Revolution*, Ithaca, N.Y. and London, 2006, 90-1. The late Dauphin had himself an interest in agronomy, though not in Physiocracy as such; see Bernard Hours, *La vertu et le secret: le dauphin, fils de Louis XV*, Paris, 2006, 344-5.

⁷⁷ Van Loo's portrait of the marquis de Marigny and his wife, a very similar composition that was exhibited, was criticized for its awkwardness, many claiming that the couple appeared to be

quarrelling; see, for example, Beaucousin, *Lettre sur le Salon de peinture de 1769*, Paris, 1769, 11; *Les Salons des "Mémoires secrets"*, 51.

⁷⁸ On the category of the 'everyday' in relation to art of this period, see, Alden Cavanagh, ed., *Performing the 'Everyday': The Culture of Genre in the Eighteenth Century*, Newark, Del, 2007.

⁷⁹ See, for example, Richard Rand, 'Love, Domesticity, and the Evolution of Genre Painting', in Rand, ed., *Intimate Encounters*, 4, 16 (note 4).

⁸⁰ Duncan, 'Happy Mothers', 579.

⁸¹ Salon of 1759, no. 83 (*Concert champêtre dont les figures sont des portraits*). The marquis, who is shown with his viol, was a distinguished amateur, who played in the orchestra of Mme de Pompadour's theatre at Versailles. See Richard D. Leppert, *Arcadia at Versailles: noble amateur musicians and their musettes and hurdy-gurdies at the French court (c.1660-1789)*, A Visual Study, Amsterdam, 1978, 74; Aileen Ribeiro, *The Art of Dress: Fashion in England and France 1750 to 1820*, New Haven and London, 1995, 163-4.

⁸² Donald Posner, 'The "Duchesse de Velours and Her Daughter: A Masterpiece by Nattier and Its Historical Context', *Metropolitan Museum Journal*, 311996, 131-141. See also Mathieu Marraud, *De la ville à l'état : la bourgeoisie parisienne, XVIIe-XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, 2009, 165-7, 172.

⁸³ Rousseau, *Emile*, 565-67. Although women continued to be portrayed at their dressing table, I know of no examples after 1760 showing the woman with her daughter.

⁸⁴ See Kimberley Chrisman-Campbell, 'Dressing to Impress: The Morning Toilette and the Fabrication of Femininity', in Charissa Bremer-David, ed. *Paris: Life and Luxury in the eighteenth century*, Los Angeles, CA., 2011, 53-73.

⁸⁵ George T. M. Shackelford and Mary Tavener Holmes, *A Magic Mirror: the Portrait in France, 1700-1900*, Houston, 1986, 52, no. 10. See also Philip Conisbee, *Painting in Eighteenth-Century France*, London, 1981, 118, 128-30; Neil Jeffares, 'Jean Valade's Portraits of the Faventines Family', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 26: 2, 2003, 225.

⁸⁶ There is a possible connection with the Pâris family of financiers; see Philip Conisbee, *French Paintings of the Fifteenth through the Eighteenth Century*, Washington, 2009, 140, no. 27 (entry by Joseph Baillio). On financiers as the focus of the critique of luxury, see Shovlin, *The Political Economy of Virtue*, 17-38.

⁸⁷ Dena Goodman, 'The *Secrétaire* and the Integration of the Eighteenth-Century Self', in Dena Goodman and Kathryn Norberg, eds. *Furnishing the Eighteenth Century: What Furniture Can Tell Us about the European and American Past*, London and New York, 186-8.

⁸⁸ Christine Favre-Lejeune, *Les secrétaires du Roi de la grande chancellerie de France : dictionnaire biographique et généalogique (1672-1789)*, Paris, 1986.476-77; Marraud, *De la ville à l'état*, 89, 210-11, 213-5.

⁸⁹ Jeffares, 'Jean Valade's Portraits', 228. See also Nicole Pellegrin, 'Le vertus de l'ouvrage': Recherches sur la féminisation des travaux d'aiguille (XVIe-XVIIIe siècles)', *Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine*, 46: 4, 1999, 747-769.

⁹⁰ On this stereotype, see Jean V. Alter, *Les Origines de la satire anti-bourgeoise en France*, 2 vols, Geneva, 1966.

⁹¹ As in Valade's portrait of Mme Faventines; see Bremer-David, *Paris: Life and Luxury*, 22-23

⁹² Joël Félix, *Les magistrats du parlement de Paris (1771-1790): dictionnaire biographique et genealogique*, Paris, 1990, 166-67.

⁹³ On his costume, see Ribeiro, *The Art of Dress*, 50. Compare Van Loo's portrait of the marquis de Boulanvilliers; see Joseph Baillio, ed., *The Arts of France from François Ier to Napoléon Ier*, New York, 2005, 218-220, no. 83.

⁹⁴ While in power, L'Averdy also commissioned a family portrait; see Joël Félix, *Finances et politique au siècle des Lumières: Le ministère L'Averdy, 1763-1768*, Paris, 1999, (cover).

⁹⁵ Habermas, *Structural Transformation*, 6-12.

⁹⁶ On their wealth, see Marraud, 210, 463-8.

⁹⁷ See Félix, *Finances et politique*, 90-1, 206; for Devin senior's art collection, see Marraud, *De la ville à l'état*, 464, 488.

⁹⁸ See, Christine Kayser, *L'Enfant chéri au siècle des Lumières: après l'Emile*, Louveciennes, 2003, 42. No. 9 9; Freund, *Portraiture and Politics*, 204.

⁹⁹ David Garrioch, *The Making of Revolutionary Paris*, Berkeley, CA., 2002, 67-75; Marraud, *De La ville à l'état*, 145, 152, 154 (prestige of drapers' guild) and 135, 245 (Marsollier-Devin-Quatremère marriages); Nicolas Lyon-Caen, *La boîte à Perrette: le jansénisme parisien au XVIIIe siècle*, Paris, 2010, 225-9.

¹⁰⁰ Anoblissement Quatremère, A.N., P 2601, cited in Xavier Caron, 'Images d'une élite au XVIIIème siècle: quarante négociants anoblis face à la question sociale', *Histoire, économie et société*, 3 :3, 1984, 41 (the author confuses different members of the family, however). See also Michel Zylberberg, *Capitalisme et catholicisme dans la France moderne: la dynastie Le Couteulx*, Paris, 2001; Marraud, *De la Ville à l'état*.

¹⁰¹ Marraud, *De la ville à l'état*; 67, 101, 129-31, 179-80, 221. For the association of the coffee (or tea) pot and tray with morning/breakfast, compare Nicolas Lancret's *Le Matin* (National Gallery 5867) and François Boucher's *Le Dejeuner* (Louvre 926).

¹⁰² For the association with Rousseau, see Christine Kayser, *L'Enfant chéri*, 42, no. 9. On the 'new father', see Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment*, 171-73.

¹⁰³ Lyon-Caen, *La boîte à Perrette*, 233, 336, 399-401, 519-22. See also David Garrioch, *The Formation of the Parisian Bourgeoisie*, Cambridge, MA, 1996, 10-62; Marraud, *De la ville à l'état*, 229-73.

¹⁰⁴ Philippe Gaston-Dreyfus, 'Catalogue raisonné de l'oeuvre peint et dessiné de Nicolas-Bernard Lépicié', *Bulletin de l'histoire de l'art français* 1922 (1923), no. 62; Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment*, 92, fig. 20; Lyon-Caen, *La boîte à Perrette*, 168-73 (on the Leroy family).

¹⁰⁵ Olivier Meslay somewhat misleadingly characterizes them as members of the liberal or enlightened nobility; see 'Henri-Pierre Danloux (1753-1908), sa carrière avant l'exil en Angleterre', *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire de l'art français*, 2006: 2007, 224, 229.

¹⁰⁶ A painting of Chartres and his family by Charles Le Peintre resembles a domestic tableau, except that it lacks any reference to the everyday round of work, meals and so on that distinguishes the bourgeois family portraits discussed here. See Bordes, 'Portraiture in the mode of genre', 265-6; Barker, *Greuze and the Painting of Sentiment*, 162, 173-5; Barker, 'From Charity to *Bienfaisance*: Picturing Good Deeds in Late Eighteenth-Century France', *Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 33.3, 300-5.

¹⁰⁷ Salon of 1767, nos. 65 and 134; For the latter, see Catherine Voiriot, 'Guillaume Voiriot (1712-1799), portraitiste de l'Académie royale de Peinture et de Sculpture', *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire de l'art français*, 2004 (2005), 130.

¹⁰⁸ Diderot, *Salon de 1767*, *Salon de 1769*, 357, 416.

¹⁰⁹ Salon of 1787, no. 146; see Anne-Marie Passez, *Antoine Vestier 1740-1824*, Paris, 1989, 156-58, no. 56. However, genealogical websites indicate that Jean Chabanel did not marry Jeanne-Adèle d'Adhémar (or d'Azémar) until 1796; it is possible that the standing woman is his first wife (died 1793). The identification of the other sitters presents similar problems.

¹¹⁰ Van Loo also depicted a female figure in this pose in a family portrait, for which see note 56 above.

¹¹¹ According to family tradition, M. Paulet was in the United States at the time; see Passez, *Vestier*, 158. However, it seems more likely that the grandfather in question was Jean Chabanel senior, a wealthy merchant of Nîmes.

¹¹² *La Bourgeoise au Sallon*, Paris, 1787, 18.

¹¹³ See, for example, Christine Adams, *A Taste for Comfort and Status: A Bourgeois Family in Eighteenth-Century France*, University Park, PA, 2000.

¹¹⁴ For a case study of François-André Vincent's 1801 portrait of the Boyer-Fonfrède family that demonstrates the exploitative practices underlying such claims to civic virtue, see Freund, *Portraiture and Politics*, 199-234. Although continuous in many respects with pre-revolutionary family portraiture, this picture is novel in its depiction of a breast-feeding mother.